



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,937	04/11/2001	David A. Bolnick	35850-165999	7702

26694 7590 12/02/2004

VENABLE, BAETJER, HOWARD AND CIVILETTI, LLP
P.O. BOX 34385
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LAN DAI T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/829,937	Applicant(s) BOLNICK ET AL.	
	Examiner lan dai thi truong	Art Unit 2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1) The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

2) Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: "the method according to step 1." It will be presumed that claim 2 depends from claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim rejections-35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3) Claims 1- 2, 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Freishtat et al. (U.S. 6,317,783), herein after referred to as Freishtat claims.

3-a) In referring to claims 1(a), 10, Freishtat disclosed user utilizes the Internet to access personal information engine which is shared identical functionality with processing server (column 4, 24-35). In particular, user always has to provide profile information to get authorization for logging to any system. In Freishtat's method, personal information configure (PIC) is used to implement the user storage what is in personal information engine (PI engine). PIC stores personal information what is

equivalent to user profile information for registration with information providers (column 5, lines 65-67; column 6, lines 1-12; column 8, lines 34-46).

3-b) In referring to claim 1(b), 1(c), 10, Freishtat disclosed particular explanation to demonstrate his knowledge on refreshing personal information which is equivalent to updated user profile information from the provider's website which is equivalent to associate to personal information engine (PI engine) which is equivalent to processing server what runs on PI host. Then the personal information engine sends updated personal profile to the user (column 4, lines 29-51).

3-c) In referring to claim 10, Freishtat disclosed a baseline configure component provides the interface which user can perform selection of the personal information providers in the system, interested personal information, and transitions to specific user (column 6, lines 22-24, 55-57). So baseline configure component is shared identical functionality with a component that provides selectable union of pushed personalized content with user profile information for conveyance to a user.

4) In referring to claim 2, Freishtat disclosed using delivery platforms such as web page is shared identical functionality with web interface, wireless device which is equivalent to wireless access device, client computer which is equivalent to a computer device, (facsimile, electronic mail) which are equivalent to any other device having at least one of direct and indirect access to the internet (column 3, lines 12-16).

5) In referring to claims 5 and 6, Freishtat discloses the information providers which is equivalent associates can be a business, a service provider, an information provider, a sports franchise (column 3, lines 8-9).

6) In referring to claim 7, Freishtat discloses aggregate-ness user profile information for information provider what is equivalent to associate (column 3, lines 24-34; column 4, lines 22-26, 43-46).

7) In referring to claims 8 and 9, Freishtat disclosed the refreshed personal information which is equivalent to updated profile information is sent from information providers are equivalent to associates to the user. Those updated profile information can be in variety delivery platforms such as facsimile what deliveries textual data form, telephone deliveries digitized audio data form, client computer deliveries either digitized video data form, graphic image data form or some other data form through internet (column 4, lines 39-41; column 3, lines 13-16). Furthermore, updated profile information can be purchase product information such as retail purchases, sports information which is about sport scores, financial information which provides bill payment or bank account balance, voicemail messages are delivered from telephone, deductions information such as bank account balance (column 3, lines 8-9, lines 17-18).

Claim rejections-35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8) Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freishtat et al. (U.S. 6,317,783), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Stambler (U.S. 5,555,303).

Freishtat did not disclose sharing access personal information to a family and a plurality of users and plurality of related users. However, Stambler disclosed sharing access personal information to a family and parties, resulting in joint code method (column 2, lines 5-25). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to share access personal information to family and a plurality of users and plurality of related users because the join code serves to authenticate the parties so they can share records, personal information and bank transaction (column 12, lines 15-27). The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to be possible to verify the identity, to secure the interests of all parties to multi-party transactions, also to make it more difficult to fraudulently generate the variable authentication number and to avoid many frauds (column 1, lines 63-67, column 5, lines 51-54).

9) Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freishtat et al. (U.S. 6,317,783), and further in view of Sato et al. (U.S. 6,057,835).

Freishtat disclosed a processor selects an end user for aggregation personal information that is equivalent to user profile information or updated user profile information (column 3, lines 24-34; column 4, lines 22-26, 43-46). Also, the processor can connect with one or more information providers, then proceeds to retrieve personalized content for selected end user from the connected information providers

Art Unit: 2132

that are equivalent to associates (abstract, lines 5-13). But Freishtat did not disclose a groupware display module operative to enable a processor to display associates list to the user. However, Sato disclosed the common window program and the programs prepared for group work (column 2, lines 6-17). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made disclose a groupware display module operative to enable a processor to display associates list to the user because Sato taught about window displays an list of user (column 2, 53-58) which is shared identical functionality with groupware display module operative. The common window system and server-client process distribute the messages to plural server (column 4, lines 11-15, 32-36). The modification would have been obvious because on of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide an operating right display system enabling, without additional operation, to obtain information on the user who own the operating right (column 4, lines 6-9).

10) Claim12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freishtat et al. (U.S. 6,317,783), and further in view of Maurille (U.S. 6,484,196).

Freishtat disclosed a processor selects an end user for aggregation personal information that is equivalent to user profile information or updated user profile information (column 3, lines 24-34; column 4, lines 22-26, 43-46). Also, the processor can connect with one or more information providers, then proceeds to retrieve personalized contain for selected end user form the connected information providers that are equivalent to associates (abstract, lines 5-13). But Freishtat did not disclose an

Art Unit: 2132

instant message service display module operative to enable a processor to display an associate list to the user. However, Maurille disclosed the communication board system with multiple modes in which the communication board system can be variously configured such as thread instant message system for instant access capability, open bulletin board system for open display capabilities and contains conversation history (column 2, lines 56-65). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made an instant message service display module operative to enable a processor to display and associates list to the user because in Maurille's system, the multiple users can exchange instant messages with one or more other users. The sever application formats messages sent to a user so that the message's contents are directly displays on a bulletin board along with threading information, then all information sends to the user in form of web pages which the user can view and respond to by using browser (abstract, lines 1-27, column 3, lines 49-65). It is easy to see that bulletin board is shared identical functionality with instant message service display module operative. The modification would have been obvious because on of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to support the conversation history (column 2, lines 60-65), and provide a message board system (column 3, lines 50-55). Those improvements could not be done before by instant message system and chat system (column 2, lines 31-34, lines 43-45).

11) Claim13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freishtat et al. (U.S. 6,317,783), and further in view of Weinberger et al. (U.S. 6,807,538).

Freishtat disclosed a processor selects an end user for aggregation personal information that is equivalent to user profile information or updated user profile information (column 3, lines 24-34; column 4, lines 22-26, 43-46). Also, the processor can connect with one or more information providers, then proceeds to retrieve personalized content for selected end user from the connected information providers that are equivalent to associates (abstract, lines 5-13). But Freishtat did not disclose an in-flight entertainment (IFE) display module operative to enable a processor to display an associate list to the user. However, Weinberger disclosed an in-flight passenger entertainment system provides services including audio and video for communication between passengers on-board, and people and computers on ground in the network (abstract, lines 1-3, column 5, lines 55-67; column 6, lines 1-4). The system contains passenger control units (CPU) and screen display (column 6, lines 14-16). Passenger can select items display on screen display (column 1, lines 16-27; column 15, lines 9-19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made an IFE display module operative to enable a processor to display and associates list to the user because in Weinberger's in-flight passenger entertainment system, Passenger can select items display on screen display which is shared identical functionality with in-flight entertainment (IFE) display module operative. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to fully integrate network passenger entertainment system that integrates audio, video, product ordering and service processing, network communications, and maintainability features. Furthermore, this system permits

Art Unit: 2132

passengers to selectively order or request products or services, receive audio, video and game data, that permits communication of information to passengers from aircraft personnel, and that permits passengers to communicate with other passengers and computer located on-board and off-board an aircraft (column3, lines 65-67; column 4, lines 1-13).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to lan dai thi truong whose telephone number is 571-272-7959. The examiner can normally be reached on monday- friday from 8:30am to 5:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2132

Lan Dai Thi Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

Ldt
11/22/2004



THOMAS R. PEESO
PRIMARY EXAMINER